

“A Message of Hope and Glad Tidings to Our Fellow Muslims in Egypt (1)”

Sheikh Ayman AL Zawahiri
-may Allah protect him-

In the Name of Allah. All praise be to Allah, and may peace and blessings be upon the Messenger of Allah, and upon his family, companions and those who follow him. To proceed:

My Muslim brothers and sisters everywhere: As-Salamu alaykum wa Rahmatullahi wa Barakatuh. To proceed:

I wish to send a message today to our fellow Muslims in Egypt. In reality it is a message to all Muslims, for what has and continues to occur in Egypt, has and continues to repeat itself in many other areas of our Islamic world. I have only chosen to focus on Egypt to give practical examples from contemporary history of tragedies which have occurred in other places. The minute details may differ, but the general characteristics remain the same across the Islamic World.

I start this first message seeking help in Allah.

I hope to discuss the current situation of Egypt by asking two questions:

- 1) The first: What is the current condition of Egypt, and similarly many other places across the Islamic world?
- 2) How can we change this current condition into one which Islam seeks for us, which is dignity in this life and success in the next?

To answer the first question, I say:

The current condition of Egypt is that it has deviated from Islam, in all aspects, from immorality and corruption, to injustice, suppression, and subservience. Corruption can be found in creed (beliefs), as well as politics, economics, finance, society and morality.

As for the corruptness of creed of the Egyptian government, I can start by highlighting the identity of this government. The Egyptian government, as stated in its principle documents, is a nationalistic, secular, democratic government. In reality, it is a nationalistic, secular, tyrannical and maybe a hereditary government.

It being “secular” means that it is an atheistic government. Secularism is in essence atheism, and if you wish to be more specific, it is non-normative, i.e. it is a creed which is unrelated to any fixed standard of ethics, whether religion, morality or otherwise. The Islamic Shariah in the constitution is only one of the many sources which may or may not be taken from. This means that the one who decides the standards or creed, as per the constitution and principle documents, is not Allah Most High, our Master, as affirmed in the Quran explicitly without any tolerance for compromise.

﴿إِنَّ الْحُكْمَ إِلَّا لِلَّهِ أَمَرَ أَلَّا تَعْبُدُوا إِلَّا إِيَّاهُ ذَلِكَ الدِّينُ الْقَيِّمُ وَلَكِنَّ أَكْثَرَ النَّاسِ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ﴾

“All judgement is for Allah alone. He has commanded that you worship none but Him; that is the (true) straight religion, but most men know not.” (Yousuf: 40)

Rather, the one who decides the creed of the government and directs it is another authority, which the constitution claims to be the people when it states their sovereignty. However, reality shows us that it is the modern Pharaoh in the republican palace who remains sovereign, and if sovereignty and authority is given to the Egyptian government, this means that it is not solely Allah's, as the Quran confirms, but rather for another rival who competes with Allah Most High in His authority and specific rights. This is what the Quran calls, “Hukm al Jahiliyyah (the judgement of Jahiliyyah), as The Most High states:

﴿أَفَحُكْمَ الْجَاهِلِيَّةِ يَبْغُونَ وَمَنْ أَحْسَنُ مِنَ اللَّهِ حُكْمًا لِّقَوْمٍ يُوقِنُونَ﴾

Do they then seek the judgement of (the days of) Ignorance? And who is better in judgement than Allah for a people who have firm Faith. (Al Maidah:50)

It being “democratic” means that sovereignty is derived from the wishes of the majority, without regards to any standard, morality or creed. A democratic government must be secular, or in other words atheist, because governance and authority is not the sole right of Allah Most High, but rather subject to the desire of the majority. A “secular democratic nation” is what they call, either to soften it or to trick people, a “civilized nation”, and regrettably this is term oft-repeated by even some who attribute to Islamic movements.

A “civilized nation” in reality is an atheist country which is governed by the wish of the majority, without adherence to any set standard, moral, or creed.

As-Sahab Media:

The strongest evidence that the Egyptian constitution and laws are in opposition to the Islamic Shariah is the ruling of the secular judges of Egypt, when Qadi Abdul-Ghaffar Muhammad confirmed in case 462/81 of the Higher Security, known as the “Great Al Jihad Case”, regarded as the biggest case in the judicial history of Egypt, said in stating the considerations of the ruling:

“In regards to the second topic, what the consciences of the court has settled upon is that the rulings of the Islamic Shariah are not implemented in the Arab Republic of Egypt.”

He also confirmed elsewhere:

“Really, the second article of the constitution, after its alteration, states that Islam is the official religion of the state, that Arabic is its official language, and that the principles of the Islamic Shariah is the main source of legislation. However, it is enough proof in the court's statement that the rulings of the constitution do not agree to the rulings of the Islamic Shariah, that which Omar Ahmed Abdul Rahman confirmed, as he is a Muslim scholar, in front of the court on Sept. 3, 1983, that the constitution clashes with the Islamic Shariah and does not seek its judgement.”(Considerations of the Judgment in Case 81/462 of The Higher Emergency State Security Court, known as the “Great Al Jihad Trial”, pp. 265, 363, 364, quoted from Kamal Khalid Al-Muhami: *They killed Sadat: Secrets of the Court Proceedings of Al Jihad Organization*, Dar Al-I'tisam, pp 180, 181, 269, 261)

Sheikh Ayman Al Zawahiri (May Allah protect him)s:

The Egyptian government claims that the constitution is democratic, but in reality it is a suppressive government who rules over its subjects with brutal agencies, rigged elections, corrupt media and a tyrannical judiciary.

It being nationalistic means that it adheres to the concept of patriotism, i.e. it is a nation based upon attribution to that nation and land, not Creed or Shariah. Thus, it differentiates between people, in that whoever is from that specific land or area is a citizen, and whoever is from somewhere other than that specific land or area is a foreigner, not given the same rights as a citizen. A Canadian in America, a Sudanese in Egypt, a Tunisian in Libya, and a Yemeni in Saudi is not able to become the president or prime minister of the nation, nor a commander in the army, a member of parliament, or even a voter. Moreover, in Saudi Arabia, most of foreigners, whether male or female, are not even permitted to marry citizens!

﴿أَمْ لَهُمْ شُرَكَاءُ شَرَعُوا لَهُمْ مِنَ الدِّينِ مَا لَمْ يَأْذَنْ بِهِ اللَّهُ وَلَوْلَا كَلِمَةُ الْفَصْلِ لَفُضِّيَ بَيْنَهُمْ وَإِنَّ الظَّالِمِينَ لَهُمْ عَذَابٌ أَلِيمٌ﴾

“Or have they partners with Allah (false gods) who have instituted for them a religion which Allah has not ordained?” (Ash-Shura: 21)

Thus, it is a government which is dedicated to and implements the concepts of Sykes-Picot which divided the Ottoman Caliphate amongst the British, French and Russians.

As-Sahab Media:

In March, 1916, Britain, France and imperial Russia reached an agreement, known as Sykes-Picot, signed in May 1916, on its specific applicable parts. This agreement divided the lands of the Ottoman Caliphate, and the most important fundamentals of the agreement were as follows:

- 1) Russia would be granted the northern and eastern provinces;
- 2) Britain and France would be granted the Arab states of the Ottoman Caliphate. France would be granted Syrian, Lebanon and southern Turkey, while Britain would be granted Palestine, Iraq, and the Sheikhdoms of the Gulf;
- 3) The Holy areas in Palestine will be alternated.

The Islamic Maghreb and Egypt had already been stripped from the Ottoman Caliphate, divided amongst the British, French, Italians, and Spanish.

In the Hijaz, its Sharif had formed an alliance with the British against the Ottoman Caliphate. Abdul Azeez Aali Saud had signed the Treaty of Darin with the government of Britain in which he affirmed his allegiance to Britain and that he would not decide on any matter except after their permission. Everything the scholars of the Najdi Dawah (of Muhammad b. Abdul Wahhab) about Al Walaa wal Baraa (loyalty and disavowal) and showing hatred and enmity to the pagans was thrown away.

On 26 Dec. 1915 CE, the Treaty of Darin was signed between Percy Cox, the British specialist on the Middle East and Abdul Azeez Aali Saud, which contained the following:

- 1) The British government respects and recognizes that Najd, Ahsa, Qateef, Jubail and its surrounding areas and lands belong to Ibn Saud and his forefathers, and those after him from his sons and successors by inheritance, but under no condition would a person who shows any enmity to the British government become ruler.

2) Ibn Saud agrees and promises not to engage in any talks, agreements, or treaties with any other foreign people or country, moreover, he is to inform the political authorities of the British government of any attempt of any other country to interfere in the aforementioned lands.

3) Ibn Saud unconditionally promises that he will not grant, sell, put as collateral, rent, or give up any of the aforementioned lands or any part of them, or give distinctions in those lands to any foreign country or its peoples without prior agreement of the British government, and that he will follow their advice in this without reservation, on the condition that it is not disadvantageous to his interests.

Sheikh Ayman Al Zawahiri (may Allah protect him):

This creed opposes Islam, which divides people on the basis of piety (taqwa) and righteous works. All Muslims are brothers and equal:

﴿إِنَّمَا الْمُؤْمِنُونَ إِخْوَةٌ﴾

“The believers are nothing else than brothers.” (Al-Hujraat: 10)

...and the Islamic lands, by the *ijma'* (consensus) of the scholars are all regarded as one nation. They must establish a Caliphate to govern it, and they must seek judgment in the Shariah.

﴿الَّذِينَ إِن مَّكَّنَّاهُمْ فِي الْأَرْضِ أَقَامُوا الصَّلَاةَ وَآتَوُا الزَّكَاةَ وَأَمَرُوا بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَنَهَوْا عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ وَلِلَّهِ عَاقِبَةُ الْأُمُورِ﴾

“Those who, if We give them power in the land, enjoin prayers, to pay the Zakat and they enjoin the good and forbid the evil. And with Allah rests the end of (all) matters. (Al-Hajj:41)

I have gone into some detail about secularism, democracy, and nationalistic states in the second print of the first volume of the book *Knights Under the Banner of the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam)*. I have also discussed in detail the deception of the Egyptian constitution in the Muslim Ummah in its discussion of the Islamic Shariah in my treatise entitled, *Muslim Egypt between the Whips of the Prison-Guards and the Stewardship of the Traitors*. Those who seek further clarification may refer to them, but here I will summarize the most important differences between the Egyptian government and an Islamic government.

1) The Egyptian government is secular in creed, while an Islamic government is one which abides by a heavenly creed.

2) The Egyptian government claims to be democratic, i.e., that its source is the wishes of the people, without adherence to any set standard, morals or creed, while an Islamic government is one of shura (consultation), in which the Ummah refers to the Shariah and judges the rulers, who are selected and also held to account by them.

3) The Egyptian government in reality, is a suppressive government which relies upon brutality and rigged elections, while an Islamic government is one based upon shura which relies upon spreading justice, confronting oppression, and enjoining the good and forbidding the evil.

4) The Egyptian government is a nationalistic government based upon the principles of the nationalistic state, which embodies the goals of the Sykes-Picot Agreement, while an Islamic gov-

ernment is one based on the principle of Muslim equality and the unity of their nations, under the shade of the Caliphate.

Now that I have clarified in summary the main fundamentals of the secular, nationalistic, suppressive government of Egypt, I wish to briefly mention how this government in Egypt was formed.

Egypt was one of the territories of the Ottoman Caliphate which was ruled by the Shariah. With growing corruption in the rulers of the Ottoman State, and Mamluks, the scholars shouldered the responsibility to enjoin the good and forbid the evil.

As-Sahab Media:

The historian Al Jabarti, may Allah have mercy on him, when discussing the events of 1209 H, states the following:

In the month of Dhul-Hijjah, it happened that Sheikh Al Sharqawi had a stake in the village of Belbis in Sharqiyyah. Its people came and complained to him about Muhammad Bey Al Alfi, saying that his followers came and oppressed them, demanding from them things which they had no ability, and so they turned to the Sheikh. Enraged he proceeded to Al Azhar and gathered the scholars. They closed the doors of the masjid and ordered the people to close the market and shops. The second day, they mounted their horses and many people gathered and followed them. They went to the home of Sheikh Sadat so that Ibrahim Bay could see them. He came to know of their gathering, and sent Ayyoub Bey Daftardar. He arrived and greeted them, stood before them and questioned them about their intentions. They replied, "We seek justice, an end to oppression and tyranny, the implementation of the Shariah, and an end to these new rules and taxes you have introduced.

The scholars rode back to Al Azhar, and the masses from east and west gathered and spent the night in the masjid. The third day, the Pasha, the Ottoman governor, arrived at the house of Ibrahim Bey, and the various Emirs met there. They sent for the scholars, so Sheikh Sadat, Sayyid Naqeeb, Sheikh Sharqawi, Sheikh Bakri, and Sheikh Ameer went there. There was much discussion, which resulted in them repenting and promising to abide by the stipulations of the scholars, to put an end to newly invented oppressive laws, to stop their followers from usurping people's wealth, and to deal with people in an amiable manner. The judge, who was present in the gathering, wrote all this down as proof which could be held against them. The scholars returned, and each of them had a huge number of people in front and behind, chanting, "It's enough what our leaders, the scholars, have accomplished is that all of the injustices, new laws, and taxes have been abolished from the Egyptian lands and kingdom." (Ajaa'ib Al Aathaar, v. 2, pp 166-7).

Sheikh Ayman Al Zawahiri (may Allah protect him):

Then the French invasion occurred, with their secular creed summarized by the French Revolution, "Let us strangle the last king with the guts of the last priest." Napoleon Bonaparte made full attempt to deceive the Egyptians of his love of the Muslims and the Ottoman Sultan, hiding his arrogant and criminal secularism, Christian at heart with a tinge of Zionism. He tried to pass the scholars by with his secular ideas by requesting them to wear the French emblem, but the scholars confronted him severely.

As Sahab Media:

The historian Al Jabarti, may Allah have mercy upon him, said when discussing the events of the month of Rabi Al Awwal on the year 1213 H.:

In it was the request of the Lashkar-e-Mast, Bonaparte, to the scholars. When they were all present, he stood up from the gathering, holding three different colored palliums – white, red, and dark blue. He placed one of them on the shoulder of Sheikh Sharqawi. and he threw it on the ground. He gave up and his mannerism changed. They descended upon the country like rulers, imprisoning, beating, and demanding with severity. His color turned wan and became harsh, and the translator said, “O’ scholars! The Lashker-e-mast has come to like you. He only wished to honor you with his clothes and emblem. If you wear this, the army and people will honor you and you will hold position in their eyes.” They replied, “However, our status with Allah and our fellow Muslims will be lost.” He was enraged by these words. (Ajaa’ib Al *Aathaar*, v.2, pp. 203-4)

Sheikh Ayman Al Zawahiri (may Allah protect him):

Even if the motto of the French revolution was freedom, fraternity, and equality, this does not apply to Muslims. Rather, the French Revolution and Bonaparte had other mottos in regard to Egypt and other Islamic lands which led to their devastation, terrorizing and massacre.

As-Sahab Media:

Napoleon wrote to General Zayonchek, the Commandant of Menoufia:

You must deal with the Turks (the Muslims) in the harshest of manners. Where I am now I kill three a day, and then order them to march around with their heads in the streets of Cairo. This is the only way to subdue these people. You must direct your attention to stripping the country from weapons in totality.

Sheikh Ayman Al Zawahiri (may Allah protect him):

Seven months after Napoleon entered Cairo, he set off for Al Sham, hoping to take control over it and the Jerusalem. However, Acre stood and confronted him with resilience. He surrounded it, but then he faced defeat after defeat, and retreat in loss. However, he issued a famous statement when he arrived at Acre, one which all Muslims must pay close attention to, in order to understand the true face of secularism which confronts us, which sings of the French Revolution and its heroes. Upon arrival at Acre, Napoleon issued his famous statement to the Jews of the world that the French government has promised to return them to their original homeland in Palestine. The secular Napoleon who claims his opposition to the Church fills his statement with a number of verses from the Bible.

As-Sahab Media:

The secular government of France had prepared plans to form a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine, in exchange that Jewish financiers would provide loans to French government which was suffering from financial crisis at the time. The Jews were supposed to finance the march eastwards, and promise to spread chaos, discord, and create crises in the areas which the French army would attack to ease their occupation. Thus, when Napoleon headed towards Al Sham and faced problems at Acre, he issued his famous call which stated:

From Emperor Napoleon to the armed forces of the French Republic in Africa and Asia to the rightful inheritors of Palestine: O’ Israelites! O unique people who no invading and excessive force could strip their name and presence, but only the land of their forefathers! Though the time and situation may not be suitable to declare or express your demands, moreover forcing you to let go of them, France presents to you the inheritance of Israel at precisely this time, and contrary to all expectations. O

rightful inheritors of Palestine! Indeed the nation who does not barter with its men or homeland (France) does not call you to take control of your inheritance, but to take what has been conquered and safeguard it to guarantee that no other people will ever interfere with it. Haste! Indeed this is the proper time to demand your rights and status from the peoples of the world, which may not reoccur for thousands of years. Those rights which were stripped from you for thousands of years, which is your political presence as a nation amongst other nations, and your natural right to worship "Yahweh" as your creed demands, publicly and forever. (Joel 4/20) Bonaparte. *The Encyclopedia of Jews, Judaism and Zionism*, v. 3, p 34, *The Secret Negotiations between Arabs and Israel* Part 1: "The Legend, the Empire, and the Jewish State", pp. 30-33.

Sheikh Ayman Al Zawahiri (may Allah protect him)

So Napoleon was the first politician to call the Jews to settle in Palestine. He declared this promise to them more than a century before the Balfour Promise.

Thus, we must stop here and clarify that secularism was introduced into our country as a result of military occupation, suppression and massacre, and it still lives off of this as we will see, and that Western secularism in its deep inside harbors enmity to Islam and sides with the Zionists.

After Muhammad Ali and his sons gained control over Egypt, foreign laws which had slowly infiltrated into the judiciary and legislature by to the direct and public and military occupation were introduced. Along with this infiltration, there was also an increase in the influence of the colonialist powers in Egypt, and their population also increased. This infiltration of judges and laws paved the way for forceful military occupation of armies and warships.

In the era of Khedive Saeed, a court for commerce was formed in 1855 CE, which was a committee of businessmen, both Egyptian and foreign, to settle commercial disputes in which one of the involved parties were foreigners. With the increase of the number and influence of foreign expatriates, consular courts were established to settle disputes between Egyptians and foreigners whose medium was not Arabic and laws were secular and man-made.

When the situation in the consular courts, which had reached seventeen in number, became chaotic, they were organized in 1975 CE by the formation of mixed courts. Its judges were foreigners, its medium was French, and the legislature was formed from Napoleonic laws, most of the judges were foreigner [sic], and it was run by foreigners. This growing foreign influence in Egypt, specifically in the judiciary and legislation, was the preface to foreign occupation as I mentioned. Britain decided to occupy Egypt under the pretext that there was unrest there. The Khedive Tawfeeq parted to the side of the British and sought their protection.

Here, we must stop and highlight the role of those scholars who held noble stances which ought to be written with ink of gold in the midst of these events. During the fight with the British invaders, Khedive Tawfeeq ordered the removal of Ahmed Arabi, the Minister of Jihad, from his post. Arabi requested that a general assembly be formed to investigate this decision, and a conference was held on Ramadan 6, 1299 H (July 7, 1882 CE) in which an estimated 500 members appeared, led by the Sheikh of Al Azhar, the supreme judge of Egypt, its Mufti, the representative of the Ashraf, the Coptic Patriarch, the Jewish Rabbi, other representatives, judges, investigators, the Director of the Directorates, and many other key figures, chancellors, nobles, as well as three princes from the ruling family. In the conference, three of the leading scholars of Al Azhar, Sheikh Muhammad Aleesh (or Ulaish), Sheikh Hasan Al Adawi and Sheikh Khalqawi, gave the verdict that the Khedive had left the fold of Islam due to his siding with the army waging war with his country. After discussion, the committee issued their decision not to remove Arabi from his position, and to put an end to the affair of the Khedive and his supporters and not to implement his commands due to his leaving the fold of the monotheistic Shariah.

As-Sahab Media:

Sheikh Aleesh - Abu Abdullah, Muhammad bin Ahmad, bin Muhammad Aleesh, was a great Maliki scholar. He was originally from the Islamic Maghreb, from Tripoli. He was born in Cairo and learned at Al Azhar. He became the lead Maliki scholar there. He was accused of siding with the Arab revolution, and was thus taken from his home at the age of eighty, in a state of sickness unable to move. He was thrown in the hospital jail and died in it, may Allah have mercy upon him.

He has many works, from them *Fat'h Al 'Ali Al Malik fil Fatwa ala Madh'hab Imam Malik*, in which he responded to question from the Ameer, Abdul Qadir Al Jazairi about the conciliation between the Sultan of the Maghreb and the French, his transgressions against the Mujahideen and cutting them from supplies, and whether it was permissible for them to fight him if he sought to fight and kill them, imprison them, and surrender them to the French. The following is an excerpt from his response.

Yes, the impermissibility for the Sultan, may Allah reform him, to do all this you mentioned is something all people know about the religion by necessity, and none who have even an atom's weight of faith in their hearts have doubt about this. The pact which he has struck is invalid and inapplicable, and selling cattle or any other animal, or other food and goods (i.e. to the French), or anything else which they may benefit from, in this mentioned case is absolutely impermissible, by *ijma'*, and is something known from the religion by necessity about which no Muslim harbors any doubts, whether the Muslims have laid siege on them or otherwise, as fighting them is an individual obligation for those who do not have a valid excuse. And if he (the Sultan of Maghreb) divides the ranks and attacks you, it becomes an individual obligation upon you to fight him, as they become like the enemy, or like rebels who have suddenly taken control, and seek to bring harm to life and women, due to their transgression and rivalry to what the Muslim scholars have agreed impermissible from your lives, women and wealth, and due to the fact that he has forbidden you from what is an individual obligation upon you by *ijma'* from waging Jihad against attacking infidels. Those who die from amongst you when fighting them are like those who die when fighting the infidels. There is nothing between him and Paradise except the exiting of the soul. Be firm in you fight against them and prepare all you can against him. (*Al-A'lam*, *Al Zarkali*, v.6, p.19; *Fat'h Al Ali Al Maliki*. v.2, p.491)

Sheikh Al Adawi, Hasan Al Adawi Al Hamzawi, was a scholar of the Malikis who learned and studied at Al Azhar. He died in Cairo. When the British took control of Egypt, Sheikh Al Adawi was presented in court for trial at the age of eighty. The head of the court asked him if he had signed the declaration for the removal of Khedive Tawfeeq. The Sheikh answered that he never saw the paper which the head of the court was referring to, but if he were to bring forth a similar declaration, he would sign it and stamp it with his stamp in front of the court. The head of the court was flabbergasted and ordered him to be taken out of the court. He was then taken to his village and imprisoned.

Sheikh Ayman Al-Zawahiri (may Allah protect him)

The British in their occupation administered Egypt with great cunningness, one which is still present to this day. Egypt had a framework of government. It had a Khedive ruler, a sultan or a king, along with a parliament, an army, police, and a nominal connection with the Ottoman state until the onset of World War I. However, the real administrators of all affairs were the British: its High Commissioner, its army, its brutality, and its advisors who penetrated into the very depths of the administrations and interests of Egypt.

History repeats itself today. Today Egypt has a president, a government, a parliament, an army and police, but the real ruler changed his seat from the British to the American Embassy!

The same story of Egypt can be said about other countries of the Islamic world. Every land has a leader, whether Kadyrov, Karzai, and Maliki, or Abdullah Al Saud or Bin Hussein; whether Ali Abdullah Saleh or Bouteflik, or the leader of Arab Zionists Hosni Mubarak or his once awaited leader son. Whomever they are, subservience is subservience, and occupation is occupation: a government, a ministry, police, a brutal intelligence apparatus, concentration camps, an army over our heads, and a real ruler who governs it from his office in the embassy, usually the American, but may also be Russian, British, French, or maybe even the Israeli embassy.

In their occupation of Egypt, they played a great role in corrupting the government, in their efforts to form a nationalist secular state which claims to be independent democratic nation, while in reality it is a country directed by the bayonets and canons of the occupiers, then the whips and prisons of their agents. They were able to achieve this through various means, from them was corrupting the legislative branch of the government. A year after the British occupation of Egypt, manmade laws were enforced over all branches of the judiciary besides the family laws and personal status. By the beginning of World War I in 1914, in which the Ottoman State fought with the British, Britain stripped Egypt from the Ottoman State, and for the first time stripped the title of "Sultan" from the ruler of Egypt, which may have made it seem as if he was under the Ottoman Sultan. To complete the frameworks of secularism for the country, the British brought out the class of Egyptians who they themselves produced to create a secular constitution which would engrain the principles of secularism in Egypt. They introduced a constitution in 1923 CE, by means of the Liberal Constitutionalist Party who were excessively cooperative with the British, which wrested Allah's sole right of legislation and assigned it to the parliament. It affirmed that the nation is the source of all authority. This was the first constitution in Egypt, rather the entire Arab world, and is regarded as the basis for all successive Egyptian constitutions created thereafter. Rather we can say that it was the basis for all successive constitutions across the Arab world which took from it. For further detail about the influence of that constitution upon latter ones, you may refer to the beginning of the first chapter of the book "The Bitter Harvest" (Al Hasaad Al Mur)

By the introduction of the constitution of 1923, the basic framework for the nationalist secular state was complete. It was a country independent of the Ottoman Caliphate, and its loyalty was not to the religion. It became a nationalistic country whose loyalty was to the state, a country which claims to be independent and democratic, whose sovereignty is derived from its people, while reality it is suppressed and subservient, whose sovereignty is derived from British bayonets and canons.

﴿وَمِنَ النَّاسِ مَن يَعْبُدُ اللَّهَ عَلَىٰ حَرْفٍ فَإِنْ أَصَابَهُ خَيْرٌ اطْمَأَنَّ بِهِ وَإِنْ أَصَابَتْهُ فِتْنَةٌ انْقَلَبَ عَلَىٰ وَجْهِهِ خَسِرَ الدُّنْيَا وَالْآخِرَةَ ذَلِكَ هُوَ الْخُسْرَانُ الْمُبِينُ﴾

"And among mankind is he who worships Allah as it were, upon an edge: if good befalls him, he is content therewith; but if a trial befalls him, he turns back on his face. He loses both this world and the Hereafter. That is the evident loss." (Al-Hajj: 11)

I will suffice with this in the first episode. I ask Allah that He allows me to complete this series, A Message of Hope and Glad Tidings to Our Fellow Muslims in Egypt, and make all our deeds correct and sincere. Our final prayer is that all praise belongs to Allah alone, the Lord of all that exists, and may peace and blessings be upon our leader, Muhammad, his family and companions.

Asalamu alaykum wa Rahmatullahi wa Barakaatuh.

Translated by:



The Global Media Islamic Front

Observing Mujahideen News and Inspiring the Believers